

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 and 17- 20 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 11 are independent. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Art Rejections

Claims 1, 2 and 5-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,924,087 to Bailey et al. (Bailey) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,356,296 to Driscoll, Jr. et al. (Driscoll). Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bailey in view of Driscoll, and further in view of Norton (USP 4139306). These rejections, insofar as they pertain to the presently pending claims, are respectfully traversed.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the present Application, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 recites a combination of elements in a system for inspecting an optical fiber, including a camera system imaging an entire circumferential surface of the optical fiber by imaging partial portions of the entire circumferential surface and then recombining the partial portions into a complete image of the entire circumferential surface. The Applicant submits that this combination of elements is not disclosed or suggested by the art of record, including Bailey and Driscoll.

In this regard, the Applicant submits that Driscoll cannot supply the deficiency of Bailey with regard to imaging portions of an entire circumferential surface of an optical fiber. While the Applicant has not conceded that Bailey teaches imaging any portions of an optical fiber, the Office Action admits at least that Bailey does not teach imaging portions of the entire circumferential surface of an optical fiber (see Office Action, paragraph 2).

The term "circumference" is defined as the boundary line of a circle. On the other hand, the term "surface" is defined as the outer or the topmost boundary of an object. See the *American Heritage Dictionary, Fourth Edition*. In light of these definitions, it is apparent that the location of an entire circumferential surface of an optical fiber is a location on the outer or topmost boundary of the optical fiber. The Applicant submits that the panoptic camera system of Driscoll cannot film an entire circumferential surface of an optical fiber, according to the ordinary meaning of an entire circumferential surface.

Rather, the camera system of Driscoll is only capable of imaging the entire surroundings of the panoptic camera system itself. In other words, the panoptic camera system of Driscoll is only capable of looking outward and away from itself to image a panoramic view.

In one explanatory embodiment, Driscoll discloses an arrangement of two hemisphere camera systems joined together (see Driscoll, FIG. 5). The arrangement of FIG. 5 will produce two annular images: one annular image for the upper hemisphere and one annular image for the lower hemisphere. Since the two camera

systems are aligned with each other, the two annular images can be optically or electronically combined to generate an image of the entire surroundings of the panoptic camera system. In the case of a fiber optic cable, the panoptic camera system of Driscoll would somehow have to be installed inside of the fiber optic cable in order to function in the manner intended by Driscoll.

The Applicant submits however, that even if it were possible to install the panoptic camera system of Driscoll inside of a fiber optic cable, the panoptic camera still would not be able to image an entire circumferential surface (outer surface) of an optical fiber. However, it is not possible to install the panoptic camera of Driscoll inside of a fiber optic cable.

For the reasons explained above, Bailey in view of Driscoll does not teach or suggest the above-recited features of independent claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this art grounds of rejection are respectfully requested.

#### Dependent Claims

With regard to dependent claims 2-10, Applicant submits that claims 2-10 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1, which is allowable for the reasons set forth above, and therefore claims 2-10 are allowable based on their dependence from claim 10. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

The Examiner states that claims 11-15, 17-18 and 20 are allowed, and that claim 19 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the early indication of allowable subject matter in this application. However, claim 19 has not been rewritten in independent form.

**Conclusion**

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Percy L. Square (Reg. No. 51,084) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Amendment filed March 18, 2005  
Response to Office Action of December 27, 2004

Appl. No. 09/550,651  
Group: 2623

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By   
Michael R. Cammarata, #39,491

MRC:PLS/mag  
4450-0168P

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000

(Rev. 09/30/03)